

Islamic Review & Muslim India.

Edited by
Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din, B.A., LL.B.
-and-
Maulvie Sadr-ud-Din, B.A., B.T.



بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ
نَحْمَدُهُ وَنُصَلِّي عَلَى رَسُولِهِ الْكَرِيمِ

The Mosque, Woking, Surrey, England.

CONTENTS

| | PAGE | | PAGE |
|---|------|--|------|
| The Text, Translation and Commentary of the Qu-rân | 241 | The Age of the New Testament. Art. II. By JOHN PARKINSON | 271 |
| The Life of the Prophet Muhammad | 242 | The Psychology of the Persian and Arabian Mystic Poets. By PROFESSOR A. NEVILLE J. WHYMANT, Ph.D., Litt.D., F.S.P. | 277 |
| What is Islam? | 248 | Islam and Civilization | 280 |
| Woman under different Social and Religious Laws. I. Early History. By SHAIKH M. H. KIDWAI | 251 | The Temptation | 281 |
| Misrepresentations of Missionaries. By LORD HEADLEY | 257 | The Solidarity of Islam. By PROF. H. M. LÉON, M.A., LL.D., F.S.P. | 285 |
| Characteristics of True Religion. By DUDLEY WRIGHT | 259 | The Prophet's Trust in God. By MOHD SAMEER BIN HAJE ISMAIL EFFENDI | 286 |
| The Gospel of Life" according to John Ruskin. By PROFESSOR N. STEPHEN | 263 | | |

PRICE SIXPENCE.

اسلامک ریویو کی قیمت میں اضافہ

موجودہ ضرورتوں کے مقابل رسالہ کا حجم کافی نہ تھا اسلئے سر دست رسالہ
 ضروری طور پر کر دیا ہے۔ آئندہ ممکن ہے بہت جلد حجم اور بڑے یا رسالہ مینہ میں
 دوبارہ جو جائز قیمت سال روان اس وقت بعض سے بحساب پانچ روپیہ وصول
 ہو رہی ہے۔ اور مینہ ان قیمت رسالہ سات روپیہ کر دی ہے۔ اسلئے میں ان حساب
 نیکھتہ مت میں عرض کرتا ہوں کہ یہ رسالہ تاجرانہ اصول پر نہیں چلایا گیا۔
 عرض یہ ہے کہ اسکی قیمت سی کا بیان مفت غیر مسلم دنیا میں تقسیم ہوں۔ اسلئے
 رسالہ کی اس عرض کو مد نظر رکھ کر اگر یہ حساب خود بخود زائد قیمت لینے یا لادینے
 میں پیچیدہ ہیں تو ان کی غایت سے والدین یہ امر ہی خدا پر چھوڑنا ہوں۔ یہ رسالہ
 تو دنیا مافی عنونہ ہے کہ اسلام کا دشمنہ چہرہ نہ صرف غیر مسلم دنیا پر چھینے
 گئے اسلئے بلکہ خود انگریزی خوان مسلم طبقہ اسلام کا عاشق ہوتا جاتا ہے
 خود بخود قلوب میں تبلیغ دین کا خاص جوش پیدا ہو رہا ہے۔ کل اسلامی دنیا
 از سر نو اصلی اسلامی زندگی کی طرف آرہی ہے۔ جن فریداران رسالہ کا سال
 سی درمیان ماہ سے شروع ہوا ہے وہ بھی اگر گذشتہ سن کا نمبر منگو کر حساب
 شروع سال سے درست کر دین تو رسالہ سے بہت سا بوجہ بٹکا ہو جاوے گا۔
 کیونکہ متفرق حساب عید کی زیادتی کو چاہتے ہیں اور بیان بکمالش نہیں۔
 میری عرض تو یہ ہے کہ حنفیہ ممکن ہو یہ رسالہ مفت تقسیم ہو۔ سو اس میں
 جو میرا مانہ بنائے وہ اللہ اپنے آپ کو ماقور کجے۔

خواجہ کمال الدین Khwaja Kamaluddin

IMPORTANT NOTICE.

To meet the complaints of such of our readers and subscribers as may not happen to receive particular numbers of the ISLAMIC REVIEW, the undersigned requests them to inform him at once.

SH. NOORAHMAD, Manager.

THE MOSQUE, WOKING, ENGLAND.



Your Sincere Brother in Islam
Muhammad Habib-Allah

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ
 مُحَمَّدٌ وَآلُهُ عَلَى سُلَالَةِ الْكُرَمِ

ISLAMIC REVIEW

AND

MUSLIM INDIA

VOL. IV]

JUNE 1916

[No. 6

THE ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF THE HOLY QUR-ÁN

NOW ALMOST READY

As was expected, the announcement of the publication of an English translation of the Holy Qur-án, with elaborate notes and the Arabic text, aroused world-wide interest, and we have been doing our best to hurry the publication. But unavoidable circumstances have delayed it, for which the gigantic war is greatly responsible. In fact, if we had not already announced the publication, and if we had not found that there is general impatience to read the translation, we would have postponed the publication till the end of the war. Prices of all the materials required for printing that voluminous Book have gone up. We found it sometimes difficult even to get the material wanted. Delays have been caused in post, and so forth. Then we found that the bulk of the Book would be much more than we had first thought ; so it was considered necessary to use India paper, the most expensive thin paper, and to enlarge the size of the book in order to reduce the bulk and make it handy. The pages will now run to about thirteen hundred. The English portion is almost finished, and would have reached the hands of the public if the Arabic text had not been considered necessary to go with the translation of the uncorrupted and uncorruptible Last Testament—the final Gospel.

Because of this war it was found not practicable to use type for the Arabic text. So now an expert copyist in India has been engaged to write out the text on the English pages sent from here. That writing is sent back to our engravers, who photograph it and obtain zincos thereof. Then the printing of the text is done in the space left for that purpose in the English translation. As is obvious, this makes the process very elaborate, and has increased the price of the work ; but because the calligraphy of the text will be very handsome, those readers who know Arabic will be much pleased with Arabic writing all done by hand. The Book, besides its precious and holy contents, will form an ornament to any library, and will be a unique work of its description. In the next number of the REVIEW we shall be able to give the specimen pages, which will be exactly as in the Book when ready. The price of the Book cannot now be lower than One Pound, which, considering the increased expenses and the expensive material used, will be nothing. We have no doubt that when the compilation reaches the hands of the public they will fully appreciate the labour of love done over it by our esteemed brother Maulvi Muhammad Ali, M.A., LL.B.

THE LIFE OF THE PROPHET MUHAMMAD

THE Holy Prophet Muhammad was born on 10th November, 570 A.D., at Mecca, of Abdallah (the youngest son of Abdul Mutaleb), who married the beautiful Aameena, a daughter of the family of the noble tribe of the Zarites. From both sides, paternal and maternal, the Prophet was of a very high and noble extraction. He was, as is known generally, one of the descendants of Abraham, part of whose "seed" settled in the wilderness of Paran. One of the branches of the children of Abraham became the perpetual guardians of the Kaaba—the temple devoted to the Unity of God. This was built by the prophet Abraham himself, aided by his son Ishmael. The spiritual privilege of the guardianship of the Kaaba won for the house of Hashem, of the Quraish tribe, at Mecca the sovereignty of the district of their settlement. The genealogy of the Hashem family, the ancestors of the Holy Prophet, presents a long line of illustrious names. As Gibbon, the historian, states: "He could produce many generations of pure and genuine nobility; he sprang from the tribe of Koreish and the family of Hashem, the most illustrious of the Arabs, the princes of Mecca, and the hereditary guardians of the Kaaba."

It may be of interest to the student of psychology to know the characteristics and traits of the ancestors of the Prophet, as this knowledge will assist towards the formation of a better idea of the qualities likely to be inherited by him.

At the time of the Prophet's birth the Arabian form of government was a Patriarchal system divided up into different clans. The people were very jealous of their liberties and of their honour, as they understood these, and refused to be governed by any chieftain who was not only himself of unblemished reputation, but insisted that he should come of a family whose honour was unsullied. The standing of any family was judged not only from the point of view of descent, but also from the standpoint of its own moral qualities, such as chivalry, chastity, hospitality, bravery and strength. The fact that the house of Hashem was accepted unanimously for the high position of the guardianship of the Kaaba points to the many excellent and noble qualities which all its members must have displayed.

Ali, a cousin of the Prophet, observed on one occasion that he could not conceive of any person, let alone a nation, committing the sin of which the nation to which Lot was sent as a prophet was guilty; and a woman of the Prophet's tribe, when called upon by the Prophet to give a pledge to lead a chaste and virtuous life, remarked that she could not think of any woman of noble blood doing otherwise.

The chastity of the father of the Prophet was put to a very severe trial on one occasion, when one of the most beautiful women of Arabia offered him a hundred camels and four hundred dirhams if he would have an immoral connection with her. "Can a *shareef* ever commit such a sin?" was the immediate reply.

Abdul Mutaleb, the grandfather of the Prophet, was very wealthy; he was also renowned for his hospitality. The doors of his house remained open day and night for the reception of strangers and visitors, or those who came to Mecca on pilgrimage. Every day over which the celebration of the pilgrimage extended, he would offer at his own expense to all the members of the pilgrimage, numbering in the aggregate many thousands of people, a beverage made of milk and honey—a few pints being the smallest quantity given to each person each day. He denied himself the luxury of wine—a praiseworthy act, when the extensive usage of the Arabian custom of drinking wine is taken into consideration. He lived an austere life, spending the whole of the month of Ramadhan in retirement in the cave of Heira, during which time he would not only feed the poor, but would also extend his hospitality to the beasts of the jungle and the birds of the air. Food was placed on the tops of the mountains for birds and animals. It was the exercise of generosity on such a scale that eventually reduced the family to straitened circumstances.

These qualities of generosity, chastity, self-control, etc., were transmitted by heredity to the Prophet, who also exercised them on a very large scale. His religion, he said, consisted of two elements—the worship of the Only True God and love towards all God's creatures. Hence we find the Qur-án replete with injunctions concerning kindness to animals, children, women, orphans, the needy, the wayfarer, the destitute, and any in need of help. He even went so

far as to say that no animal or insect should ever be burnt alive. The Prophet adopted the practice of his grandfather in keeping vigil in the cave of Heira during the month of Ramadhan, a practice which he continued to follow during the whole of his sovereignty and prophethood, and often he was asked by his disciples why he insisted on fasting throughout the day and keeping watch throughout the night and why he stood so long in his prayers to his God that it led to his swollen feet? His answer was simply: "Why should I not be a grateful servant of God?"

The grandfather of the Prophet had a very great love for the boy, who early manifested some very promising traits in his character. On one occasion, when he was lost for a time, his grandfather's grief was profound; and his joy upon the boy being found was so great that he caused a thousand camels to be slaughtered and their flesh distributed to the poor, while, in addition, fifty *ratals* of gold were given in charity.

The father of the Prophet died a few months before his son was born, and his mother when he was only six years of age. After a few years he was deprived of the tender care of his grandfather Abdul Mutaleb also, and came under the guardianship of his uncle, Abu Taleb. Haleema, of the tribe of Bani Sa'd, continued to be his nurse. The Prophet always entertained a great respect for this nurse and her offspring. A reference will be made later to the kindly treatment extended to her by the Prophet. He treated her with the affection of a son towards his mother, and he treated her daughter as a brother would a sister. This conduct adds lustre to the Prophet, who did not adopt the practice followed by some of his rank, who ignore those below them in station. The nobility of the Prophet was too great to have regard to such mean considerations; his hereditary qualities of nobleness and gentleness rising superior to any thought of rank.

The Prophet received no education in the sense in which this term is understood generally, but he was a close student of nature, and his teachings are all based upon the phenomena which can be observed by all. His precepts are accordingly free from untenable and impracticable dogmatism.

His uncle, Abu Taleb, who proved a pillar of strength to him, even at the commencement of his ministry, took him to Syria on one or two occasions, journeys which assisted in the widening of his mental horizon. This method of education continued later when his honesty, uprightness, and prudence attracted one of the richest women in Arabia and led her to employ him as her representative in many commercial transactions which involved several long journeyings. These travels brought to his personal notice the condition of peoples and religions other than those he found in his own town, and the transactions which he carried through served to establish more and more his already known virtues.

The Arabs were noted for their love of commercial pursuits, and esteemed but lightly those who were not engaged in merchandise. The Prophet bethought of devoting himself to some business pursuit. His uncle, who loved him intensely, made the suggestion that he should apply to Khadijah for employment. His modesty and natural shyness, however, prevented him from doing this, although his uncle assured him that if Khadijah did but know that he had a desire to enter upon a commercial career, she would be delighted to offer employment to one who had already earned for himself a character for trustworthiness. The Prophet did not make the application, but in some way Khadijah came to hear of his desire and sent for him.

Muhammad stuck to the principle that honesty of purpose and dealing in commerce more than anything else is the sure means of success, and carried the business entrusted by Khadijah on that principle. On his return from Syria on one occasion Khadijah was so pleased at the result that she gave him double the remuneration agreed upon as a reward for his fidelity to her interests.

Khadijah was a wealthy widow of very high moral character, whose many excellent qualities and virtuous reputation were such that the highest in the land would have been proud to be wedded to her. She, after gaining some experience of the qualities and virtues of the Prophet, sent of her own free-will and initiative an intimation to the Prophet that she would be willing to become his wife. The Prophet, surprised beyond measure, pointed out that he was not a wealthy man, but the messenger replied that Khadijah was seeking character in a spouse rather than wealth.

When the Prophet and Khadijah were married the former was twenty-five years of age and the latter forty, and the marriage was the means of effecting a very happy union between two great families, many orations being delivered on the occasion by the relatives of each. The words of Abu Taleb are worthy of note. Addressing the assembled company, he said that money was something transitory but noble qualities were substantial, and though the Prophet's family were then in comparatively poor circumstances because of their unlimited generosity, yet he excelled in character for virtue, trustworthiness, and uprightness. Wealth and nobility of character did not, he said, always go hand in hand, and wealth was not of importance when compared with virtue. Warka bin Nauffal, an uncle of Khadijah, who was a Christian, expressed his delight for the assembly at the happy union. Khadijah, it may be stated, was known as Assayyida Al Tahira, an expression which means "the highest of women, pure and chaste," while Muhammad was known as Al-Ameen, or "the trustworthy." On the occasion of the wedding, feasts on a very large scale were provided for friends and also for the poor and needy. During the years of his very happy conjugal life with Khadijah the Prophet did not for one moment relax what he regarded as his religious duties and remained extraordinarily devoted to prayer and fasting and vigils. As has been said, in emulation of his grandfather it was his custom to pass the holy month of Ramadhan in the cave of Heira, abstaining from food and drink, and in this practice he now had a companion in Khadijah, who had a sincere love for her husband and looked after him with great tenderness. His religious practices, however, were not tainted in any way with asceticism, which he always condemned unsparingly.

He would always help the wayfarer and needy, the widows and orphans—the latter particularly attracting his chief attention. He always sought the opportunity to render personal service to the people of Mecca. His heart was so kind and tender that he could not endure the sight of human suffering. He had a great love for children, a chivalrous respect for women, and a singular regard for the aged. His countrymen knew him full well and loved him for all he did for them. He gained their confidence generally, and it was with unanimity that he was hailed by them with the title of Al-Ameen, which his fidelity and philanthropy well merited.

Two of his early public acts stand out very prominently in the history of Arabia ; one was the relief of the suffering caused by the death of his grandfather, Abdul Mutaleb, and the other was the restoration of peace which a family quarrel had disturbed. As to the first, the Meccans were in sore straits for some time owing to the absence of good administration, and he organized a League in which he was the moving spirit. This organization dealt efficiently with the situation and relieved the suffering. The second important public work which he did in his young days was to reconcile the various factions which were going to involve themselves in a furious civil war. When, on the rebuilding of the Kaaba, the walls of the temple had reached the height of four feet, the sacred Black Stone had to be fixed in its place. Many of the families of the Quraish claimed the honour of doing this, and a violent discussion arose and the further progress of the building was stopped. Each tribe having its allies in the country, an outbreak of war would result in carnage throughout the length and breadth of Arabia. The chiefs being thoroughly conscious of this, one of the number then suggested that the first to enter the court of the Kaaba by the eastern gate should be asked to decide the dispute. This proposal was agreed to, and the joy of all was great when presently the Prophet was seen to enter. It was with gladness that the shout went up: "Here is Al Ameen!" followed by loud "Hurrahs." On the matter in dispute being stated to Muhammad, he took off his cloak, spread it on the ground, and placed the Black Stone upon it. He then directed that the leader of each clan should together lift the cloak with its precious burden, and in this way the Stone was placed in position.

Thus was civil war averted. The Prophet might well—and no one would have raised any objection whatever—have exercised the right to place the Stone in position himself, or asked his own tribe to do so ; but, instead, he decided the question in a statesmanlike manner. He gave an opportunity to all the clans to be represented in the sacred task about which they were disputing bitterly. Such are some of the qualities which characterized the actions of the Prophet and which were in complete harmony with his teachings. They illustrate not only his dignity and wisdom, but also the regard which the people had for him even before his career as a prophet commenced.

(To be continued.)

WHAT IS ISLAM?

Islam is a simple Faith. A belief in One and only God (Allah), possessing all the conceivable good attributes and absolutely free from all frailties, is its first principle. Those who follow Islam are called Muslims or Musalmans, but **not** Muhammadans. They worship One God—the All-mighty, the All-knowing, the All-just, the Cherisher of the Worlds, the Master of the East and the West, the Author of the heavens and earth, the Creator of all that exists. The God of Islam is Loving and Forgiving, but also just and swift in reckoning. He is the Friend ; the Guide ; the Helper. Every place is sacred to Him. There is none like Him. He has no partner or co-sharer. He has begotten no sons or daughters. He is free from passions, and is indivisible, impersonal. From Him all have come and to Him all return. He is the Light of the Heaven and the Earth, the Glorious, the Magnificent, the Beautiful, the Eternal, the Infinite, the First and the Last.

The Prophet of Islam was Muhammad, whom the Muslims must follow. He was the last Prophet, and finally and faithfully preached and established the doctrine of the Unity of God in a way that it can never now be shaken by any amount of progress of rationalism. Those who believe in the doctrine of the Unity of God are expected to respect His servant and messenger who established that doctrine. Muhammad is highly revered by all the Muslims, but is recognized as a man as are other Prophets, like Abraham, Moses, Jesus, etc., who are all respected by Muslims as righteous persons sent down by the loving God to guide His children. All the Prophets, whether of the East or the West, the North or the South, brought the same common message from the Creator, but their followers afterwards altered or corrupted it until Muhammad came, who left behind him an uncorruptible book.

The Gospel of Muslims is Al-Quran. It teaches man how to hold direct communion with his Maker, and also how to deal with his fellow-beings as well as God's other creatures. It has enjoined, "Be constant in prayer, for prayer preserveth from crimes and from that which is blamable, and the remembrance of Allah is surely a most sacred duty." But it has also said, "Blessed are they who fulfil the covenant of God and break not their compact ; and who join together what God

hath bidden to be joined ; and who fear their Lord and dread an ill-reckoning ; and who from a sincere desire to please their Lord are constant amid trials, and observe prayers, and give alms in secret and openly out of what We have bestowed on them ; and turn aside evil with good ; for them there is the recompense of that abode, gardens of eternal habitation, into which they shall enter, together with such as shall have acted rightly from among their fathers ; their wives and their posterity and the angels shall go in unto them by every portal (saying) Peace be with you ! because you have endured with patience " (Sura xiii. 20-24).

Al-Quran is a book which has withstood the ravages of time, and stands to-day, after more than thirteen centuries, word for word and letter for letter as it came out of the mouth of the Prophet Muhammad. There are hundreds of thousands of Muslims who know the whole of it by heart. It is an uncorrupted and a living book, and the religion it preaches is a living religion.

There is no Priesthood in Islam. There is no intercession, no redemption, no saviourship. Every soul is responsible for its own actions. Islam points out both the ways—the one which brings to God, and that is *good*, the other which leads away from Him, and that is *evil*. No one can carry the burden of the other. Sincere repentance secures forgiveness. "O My servants, who have transgressed to your own injury, despair not of Allah's mercy, for all sins doth Allah forgive, gracious and merciful is He" (Quran, chap. xxxix. 54).

Islam does not recognize any difference of sex in piety. Whether males or females, those who act rightly get their salvation. It does not lay down that human beings are born sinners or that woman was instrumental in the "fall of Adam." The holy Prophet has said, "Paradise lies at the feet of mother."

Islam forbids impurity of every kind. Cleanliness, both of body and mind, is essential for a Muslim. Physical cleanliness is a natural concomitant to the idea of moral purity, for no man can approach Him Who is All Pure and Clean in a state of uncleanness. All intoxicants are forbidden, so is gambling and the flesh of the pig. Suicide is practically unknown among Muslims.

Islam enjoins prayers, fixed alms to the needy, fasting,

affection to parents and kindness to all creatures—even animals and birds.

Islam encourages rational views and scientific research by declaring that sun and moon and all the elements are subservient to human intellect and will in a great measure, and man can utilize them if he discovers the secret of those laws according to which they work.

The Universal Brotherhood of Islam has been joined by many English men and women of different grades in society. A British Muslim Society has been formed which has Lord Headley as its president, Mr. J. Parkinson as its vice-president, and Mr. Sims as its assistant-secretary. The Russian nobleman Yourkevitch, the French Viscount de Potier, the Egyptian Princess Saleha, Capt. S. Musgrave, Lieut. Barry Gifford, Mr. Basheer Muller, Major R. Legge, Prof. N. Stephen, Prof. H. M. Léon, M.A., Ph.D., LL.D., Prof. Ameen J. Whymant, Ph.D., Litt.D., Mrs. Clifford, Mr. Dudley Wright, Mrs. Howell, Miss Potter, Capt. A. A. MacLaughlin, Mr. Flight, Madam Bloch, Mr. and Mrs. Welch, and Mrs. Rose Legge are some of its members. The Brotherhood, being universal, is open to all, and anybody who would like to join it can either attend the Friday Prayers at 12.45 p.m. at 39 Upper Bedford Place, London, W.C., on any Friday; or Sunday services held at 3.15 p.m. at the Woking Mosque; or send a written declaration to the Imam of the Mosque, Woking, Surrey, who will always be glad to answer any inquiries. Islam claims to be a rational faith, and undertakes to satisfy the reason and conscience both, so criticism is encouraged and every effort made to answer questions satisfactorily.

DECLARATION FORM.

I _____ <sup>son
daughter
wife</sup> of _____
of (address) _____ do hereby faithfully and solemnly declare of my own free will that I adopt ISLAM as my religion; that I worship One and only Allah (God) alone; that I believe Muhammad to be His messenger and servant; that I respect equally all prophets—Abraham, Moses, Jesus, etc.; that I will live a Muslim life by the help of Allah.

La ilaha ill-Allah,

Muhammad al rasul-Allah.

N.B.—Please address all inquiries to the Maulvi Sadr-ud-Din, B.A., B.T., Head of the Mosque, Woking, Surrey.

WOMAN

UNDER DIFFERENT SOCIAL AND RELIGIOUS LAWS

By SHAIKH M. H. KIDWAI

I

EARLY HISTORY

IN the long, long history of humanity and its development, in the propagation of the human race and in the social economy of the world, woman has been as important a factor as man, yet she was always looked down upon as an inferior creature until an orphan in the desert of Arabia issued the Divine injunction—

“Respect the wombs (women).”

“The very word ‘woman’ (old English, *wifmann*), etymologically meaning a wife (or the wife division of the human race, the female of the species *Homo*), sums up,” says the “Encyclopædia Britannica,” “a long history of dependence and subordination.”

The most ancient history known to us is an undying witness of the fact that woman has always been kept in subordination and has always been treated as inferior to man in rights and privileges. “Such,” says Gibbon, “was the stern and haughty spirit of the ancient law that women were condemned to the perpetual tutelage of priests, husbands, or guardians; a sex created to please and to obey was never supposed to have attained the age of reason and experience.”

In Roman law a woman was completely dependent. As an unmarried girl she was under the perpetual tutelage of her father during his life, and after his death of her agnates by blood or adoption. When married, she and her whole property passed into the power and possession of her husband. In fact, she herself was treated as a property by her husband, and had no more right than a purchased slave. At certain stages of the Roman law a husband was given a right to kill his wife if she was found to have poisoned somebody, or treated somebody with wine, or adopted as her own child somebody else’s child. The English law, like many other European laws, is based on the Roman law, so that the fair sex of England should thank their stars that such stringent and unfavourable portions of the Roman law as those mentioned above did not actually get a

place in the statutes of Great Britain. However, it will be seen how far British law did adopt the rules of Roman law when one reads the history of Roman laws and customs. The Romans did not allow women to exercise any civil or public office. In fact, a woman could not even be a witness or a curator; she could not adopt nor could she be adopted; she could not be a surety or a tutor. Like her sister in England only about thirty years ago, she had no personal property independent of her husband; she could not make a will nor a contract.

With a view to secure a robust progeny, Lycurgus delayed the time of marriage, which was put by Numa at the age of twelve years. According to the custom of antiquity the would-be husband bought his bride of her parents, and she fulfilled the coemption by purchasing, with three pieces of copper, a just introduction to his house and household deities. But this partnership on the side of woman was stringent and unequal, as she had to renounce the name and worship of her father's house and to embrace a new servitude. She was treated just like children—her own children—by her husband or master, who was invested with the plenitude of paternal power over her just as over her daughter. By his judgment or caprice her behaviour was approved, or censured, or chastised; he exercised the jurisdiction of life and death; and it was allowed that in the case of adultery, and even if she had tasted wine or stolen the key of the cellar, she could be quite justifiably killed by him. She acquired and inherited for the sole profit of her lord and master (the husband); and so clearly was woman defined, not as a *person*, but as a *thing*, that, if the original title was deficient, she might be claimed, like other movables, by the *use* and possession of an entire year. While the Athenian and Judaic laws scrupulously exacted the conjugal debt, the Roman husband did as he felt inclined.

When the writer of these pages visited the excavations of Pompeii and saw the indecent statues and fountains in the courtyards of houses which must have been the residential quarters of respectable and well-to-do people, when he witnessed indecent and filthy paintings on the walls of spacious rooms, he could draw only one of two conclusions. Either in that period of the history of the Roman Empire woman was kept in seclusion and could not enter the quarters reserved for males; or no regard was paid by the sterner sex to the senti-

ments and modesty of the fair sex. The presence of houses for immoral purposes throws its own light upon the then social condition of Roman society.

The condition of the old Roman society can also be judged from the following :—

The daughter of the great Theodosius had been the captive and the queen of Goths. She was dragged in chains by her insulting assassins; she tasted the pleasure of revenge, and was exchanged in the treaty of peace for six thousand measures of wheat. After her return from Spain to Italy, Palæidia experienced a new persecution in the bosom of her family. She was averse to a marriage which had been stipulated without her consent; and the brave Constantius received, from the hand of Honorius himself, the struggling and reluctant hand of the widow of Adolphus. After the death of Constantius "the indecent familiarity of her brother, which might be no more than the symptoms of a childish affection, was universally attributed to incestuous love."

M. Gustave le Bon says that in Rome the rule of a husband over his wife was despotic: woman was treated like a slave, and had no share in the social economy. Except her husband, nobody else could judge her conduct, but the husband could even kill her. Even as to the later history of Rome M. Garin le Loherain says that Charlemagne himself had one day an argument with his sister, and ended it by attacking her, tearing her hair from her head, thrashing her, and with his mailed fist breaking three of her teeth.

Polygamy was by no means unknown in Rome, though at first it was not a very popular institution. We know for a fact that Mark Antony had two wives, and from that time the institution did not remain unpopular. In the surrounding States generally, and especially among the Tuscans, plurality of wives was always allowed. The Roman marriage required the previous approbation of the father, even if he was insane. The causes of the dissolution of matrimony varied at different times. In the first ages the father of a family might sell his children, and a wife, being reckoned in the number of children, could be disposed of also. He might pronounce her death if she became offensive, or his mercy might expel her from his bed and house; but the slavery of the wretched female was hopeless and perpetual, unless he asserted for his own convenience the manly prerogatives of divorce.

This is the history of woman, as given by Gibbon and others, in an empire which is considered to have been the most magnificent and civilized empire, and from which modern Europe has adopted many laws and customs, and is proud of having done so.

The condition of woman in other civilized nations and countries of old was no better than it was in Rome. In all Syro-Phœnician peoples bestiality prevailed, and woman was considered only a means for procreation of children.

In Sparta, female infants and such women who could not be expected to give birth to healthy sons were often destroyed, and the result of it was that the proportion of women in the population was reduced and one woman had several husbands. The loan of the wife of one man to another to get a good "breed" was also permitted.

By old Athenians woman was treated only as a property that was marketable and could be transferred from one to the other. She could also be willed away. Those civilized people considered woman a kind of peril or evil. Even at the highest stage of Grecian civilization no other class of women except the prostitute was the subject of any regard, and so if there was any education and culture it was only in the prostitutes. An Athenian was allowed to have any number of wives. Prof. Westermarck says that in Greece man recognized in her no other end than to minister to his pleasure or to become the mother of his children. There was also a general notion that she was more vicious, more addicted to envy, discontent, evil-speaking, and wantonness than man. Plato classes women together with children and servants, and states generally that in all the pursuits of mankind the female sex is inferior to the male. Euripides says "women are impotent for good, but clever contrivers of all evil."

In Persia, a country so near to that from which woman got her magna charta of liberty and secured a position of honour and respect, men were notoriously voluptuous, and to them woman was nothing more than an object to gratify their base passions. Every wealthy man kept crowds of females in his house, and in the sixth century of the Christian era Mazdak laid down a law that woman should be treated exactly like any other property. He announced himself as a reformer of Zoroastrianism, and carried the doctrine of duality (the two

opposite principles) to a much greater height. He taught the absolute indifference of human action, perfect equality of rank, community of property and women, and marriage between the nearest kindred. Döllinger says, in his history of "The Gentiles and the Jews," that to the Persians their religion itself offered a premium on the multiplicity of wives and concubines.

We do not know much of the social laws and customs of old Egypt and Babylon, but the little we know is to the effect that women did not occupy a very honourable position even among them. The Rt. Hon. Ameer Ali says, on high authorities, that among the Thracians, Lydians, and the Pelasgian races settled in various parts of Europe and Western Asia the custom of plurality of marriage prevailed to an inordinate extent, and dwarfs all comparison with the practice prevailing elsewhere. We know more details of the social life of that nation whose civilization can be said to have been contemporaneous with that of the Egyptians and Babylonians.

Hindu laws and customs were extremely unfavourable to woman. She was treated as very inferior to man. Their great lawgiver Manu says, "Day and night must women be held by their protectors in a status of subjection," that the woman is under the subjection of her father when a child, when married under that of her husband, after her husband under her sons, and if she has no sons then to her agnatic relations, because there is no woman whatsoever who is fit to be independent. He further says: "Women love their beds and ornaments, and have loose desires. They have a bad temper, are frail, irresolute, and never straight. They should always be kept under subjection and control." That of ill-luck, storm, death, hell, prison, snake, nothing is so dreadful as woman. It is true that after some time life-interest in the property was given to them under the name of *stridhan*, but because the custom of *suttee* came into practice that right was of no practical value. A widow burnt herself alive with the dead body of her husband, and that horrible custom was the most gloomy picture of the position that women held in the social economy of the Hindu life.

Woman was sometimes made the wife of several brothers at the same time. She was sometimes put on the gambling stake and lost.

Even up to the present day there is no limit to polygamous marriages in Hindu society. A Hindu widow cannot adopt

a son unless her deceased husband has left her permission to do so. She cannot get any alienable right in property. She is married without her consent when only a child of four or five years of age. No girl is adopted by Hindus. Remarriage is not allowed. Once married, she cannot get a divorce. Her status in society is negligible. A father is never expected to eat at her husband's house, and so on.

The wise men of China have offered free advice for the benefit of husbands in these words: "Listen to the counsel of your wife, but act against it."

The old men of Russia have said that "There is only one soul among ten women."

The Spaniards say, "We should save ourselves from wicked, women, and should never be captivated by any that have good looks."

The Italians go a step farther and pronounce: "As a horse, whether good or bad, requires spurs, so a woman, whether good or bad, requires thrashing."

In Japan, in olden times, women were not allowed to pray or take any part in religious exercises. In China they were not suffered to go into the temples. In India they could not touch gods.

As far as the Arabs themselves were concerned, they treated woman, before the advent of the Great World-Reformer their country produced, worse than perhaps any other people did. They buried alive their daughters. It was considered to be an inauspicious omen if a girl was born to anybody. A woman, after the death of her husband, was treated just like another property, and her own son inherited her as a wife. Innocent girls were offered as a sacrifice to the idols. Orphan girls were forced to marry their guardians. There was no limit to polygamy. Ibn Khaldun says that in some clans even polyandry was permissible.

It has been said, on the authority of Arab chroniclers, that the pagan Arabs had long practised the inhuman custom of burying their daughters alive lest they should be reduced to poverty by providing for them, or else to avoid the disgrace which would follow if they should happen to be made captives, or to become scandalous by their behaviour. So the birth of a daughter was considered to be a great misfortune, and the death of one as great a happiness.

The Arabs were not by any means alone in murdering their female children or in offering them as a sacrifice to gods. In Japan, China, India, female children were killed by parents themselves. By the laws of Lycurgus no child was allowed to be brought up without the approbation of public officers. But the pagan Arabs, and specially the clan in which the great Prophet was born, used very painful methods to do away with their female children. When an Arab had a daughter born, if he intended to bring her up he sent her, clothed in a garment of wool, to keep camels or sheep in the desert ; but if he designed to put her to death, he let her live till she became six years old, and then said to her mother, " Perfume her, and adorn her, that I may carry her to her mothers " ; and when she was perfumed and adorned the father led her to a well or pit dug for that purpose, and having bid the innocent little creature to look down into it, pushed her in headlong from behind, and then filling up the pit, levelled it with the rest of the ground.

In short, woman was treated unfavourably all over the world before the advent of Muhammad. *Almost all the social laws were against her.*

(To be continued.)

MISREPRESENTATIONS OF MISSIONARIES

By LORD HEADLEY

TOWARDS the end of March I received a letter from a lady who has travelled in the East and formed certain opinions of Muslims she has met. She writes :—

" 18/3/16.

" DEAR SIR,

" After reading your letter in yesterday's *Daily Graphic* re ' A Muslim Memorial ' I feel you are treading on very dangerous ground, and are setting a trap for many an ignorant and unwary Englishman. I have been some time in the East, and know only too well the reason why the Muslim creed appeals to the Englishman who is (as a Christian) only allowed one wife. I hear you hold the Muslim creed—may I ask why not the *true*, original one delivered to us by the ' uniquely begotten son of God ' ? I suppose it is too strait an one to please the modern Englishman. I met some of your faith on

my way home from the East a short time ago, and some of them were so utterly ignorant that they thought in truth that the Muslim creed was of older date than that of their Christian brothers. Of course, living in the East, I can quite see that it appeals to men.

"I wonder, when I come across men like you, if you have ever studied our Scriptures? Christ's command to us was—'Search the scriptures' (the Old Testament this was), 'for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they *which testify of me.*' Have *you* ever searched those Scriptures? If you have, I am quite sure you have done it with your spirit eyes shut—the things of the Spirit can only be discerned by the Spirit."

The lady has written to me since the above date, and, though she has modified her statements about my ignorance of the Scriptures, she clings tenaciously to the idea that the chief attraction of the Muslim faith lies in the plurality of wives. I do not think she realizes that the grand Muslim idea of the Unity of God must be older than any of the creeds. As Muslims, we accept the teachings which have reached us through various channels of great antiquity. Adam, Noah, Abraham, Moses and Christ, all, in their day, gave the messages of God which have come down to us, and we hold that the great Prophet of Arabia, Muhammad (of ever blessed memory), delivered the last messages, and directed all his energies to the improvement of mankind and the abolition of idolatry. His preaching was very simple, his charity unbounded, and his example excellent. My correspondent in her last letter says: "I think no country in the world holds its women in such respect and reverence as we do in England—and it would be a VERY sorry day for us if we ever fell from that standard. Of course your Prophet was a law unto himself; and one must admit—though I do not for a moment say he was not superior to many around him—that he did not preach a doctrine of chastity! On the contrary, it seems to me that he was *most* self-indulgent, and *my* theory is that 'only sacrifice is fruitful.'"

In all this there is complete forgetfulness of the conditions of life in Arabia and what changes were wrought by the influence of the Holy Prophet, and the fact that he improved the con-

dition of women is apparently lost sight of. One does not like to put this down to wilful misunderstanding, and I am rather inclined to attribute it to an inability to get clear of the fetters which a long course of missionary misrepresentation has wound about the intelligence. I hope in a future article to touch on some further points in this lady's later letters, and also to discuss an article entitled "Prussianism and Islam" which appeared in *The Christian* last January. This article is full of interest just now, as it deals with the history of Islam, the spirit of the crusades, the irreligion of Berlin, the German mind, and the message of Luther, in a very remarkable manner.

CHARACTERISTICS OF TRUE RELIGION

By DUDLEY WRIGHT

WHAT is Religion? It has been said that "Men will wrangle for religion, write for it, fight for it, die for it: anything but live for it"; but probably the writer of that epigram had in view the various forms of dogma, ritual, or ceremonial around which incessant warfare has waged for centuries. Nor is religion entirely a matter of intellectual knowledge. Aristotle declared that the intellect itself moves nothing: it has no dynamic force. A creed is valueless until it is incorporated with the life. Intellectual knowledge must have added to it faith, which is an act of the whole personality. Religion is the one link between humanity and Deity; it is that which binds man to God, as the etymology of the word indicates. What, then, should be the characteristics of true religion?

One of the points from which the value of any religious system must be estimated is its practical and abiding influence on the common relations of mankind, in the affairs of everyday life, and its power on the masses. Its influence for good upon the individual who accepts its teachings should be not only immediate but permanent. The tenets must conflict at no stage in its history with any advance that may be made in science, and they must be of such a character that without altering in any way its fundamental principles the religion shall always be equal to the needs, both ethical and social, of a progressive community. Surely, also, one of the character-

istics of true religion should be its universal applicability: it must not be limited to any one country or race. Some of the great religious systems have been and are limited in their territory of promulgation or adoption, e.g. Confucianism, Shintoism, Hinduism, and Buddhism; and a writer in the ISLAMIC REVIEW for April 1916 showed in a conclusive manner that the religion taught by Jesus was intended to be limited in its application. Efforts have been made of late years to extend the knowledge and adoption of Hinduism and Buddhism—the former certainly in a corrupted form—and to seek for converts to these faiths in the Western world, but it cannot be claimed that these attempts have been crowned with success.

True Religion is a great unifier. When, after the death of the prophet Jesus, the Christian Church was founded, brotherhood and equality were two of its recognized principles, although, apparently, not of long duration. In no religion is this spirit of brotherhood developed so naturally and firmly as in Islam. Canon Sell instances this as one of the causes of the sustained vitality and the increasing expansion of Islam. "It makes," he says, "a great help—one God and Muhammad His prophet—a great community from East to West, and at once gives a brotherhood in any Muslim house."

One great danger attendant upon all religious systems is when primitive sincerity and simplicity give place to formality. A well-known Canadian General said recently that in the conduct of war it is necessary to get back to the primitive and shed oneself of everything that is artificial. That is certainly true of religion. There should be, there must be—nay, there can be—nothing that is artificial in the relationship between man and God. Formality is very likely to step in where objects of worship are set up, whether inanimate objects as visible expressions of great truths or the prophet of the religion, whose personality, however great it may be, cannot ensure the permanence of the faith which he preached. That faith must be based upon irrefutable truth, and be able to stand by itself without requiring or demanding the support of its prophet. If not thus founded it will deteriorate, and ultimately vanish or become absorbed into another system.

Can there ever be an absolutely new religion? Islam was not a new religion. The Prophet Muhammad was particular

in emphasizing the fact that he was not propounding any new doctrines. It was the belief of Muhammad—and a moment's consideration will be sufficient to convince any that the belief was an extremely rational one—that the only true religion had been revealed to man at the earliest stage in human history, and that such religion inculcated the direct and spiritual worship of the one true and only God, the Creator of the universe, the King of all the worlds. He taught—and here the criteria of history may be quoted in support—that this religion had repeatedly been corrupted and debased by man and outraged by idolatry, and that a succession of prophets, divinely appointed and commissioned, had been sent to restore this truth to mankind, but again and again the faith so restored by them had become vitiated by their followers. The Prophet recognized that the principal cause of this corruption had been idolatry, and therefore, as far as it was possible for him to do so, he hedged around the truth which he resuscitated such safeguards that no human device could demolish. He prevented the deification and worship of himself by the wording of the *Kalima*: "There is no Deity but God, and Muhammad is His Prophet." That is all. Nothing more. Only the Prophet, the messenger sent to declare the truth. There was nothing new in the religion. "We follow," says the Qur-án, "the religion of Abraham, the orthodox, who was no idolater. We believe in God and that which hath been sent down to us, and that which hath been sent down unto Abraham and Ishmael, and Isaac and Jacob and the tribes, and that which was delivered unto Moses and Jesus, and that which was delivered unto the prophets from the Lord ; we make no distinction between any of them, and to God we are resigned."

For many years the Christian world has been discussing what means to adopt to cope with the evils of drink and gambling, and it is very seldom that one can take up a Christian periodical without encountering articles dealing with these two problems. The Faith of Islam is the largest and oldest temperance society in the world, while the curse of gambling is unknown wherever Muslims congregate. Why? Because both are forbidden by the Qur-án.

There are many remarkable characteristics about the Faith of Islam, and not the least remarkable is the fact that although, as even its opponents acknowledge, it is gaining ground rapidly

wherever it is preached, yet it has no paid agents or missionaries. The Rev. W. H. Gairdner, in his work "The Reproach of Islam," says: "How comes it that every Muslim is proud of Islam, loves Islam in his own fashion, and therefore stands for Islam wherever he goes: and so is a Muslim missionary? To the modern Christian world, missions imply organizations, societies, paid agents, subscriptions, reports. All this is practically absent from the present Muslim ideas of propagation, and yet the spread of Islam goes on." "Every good Mussulman," says Canon Sell, "is a missionary. Christian traders have not done much to spread Christianity in the various lands they have discovered and explored, but the Arab merchants have won for Islam some of its famous provinces."

The various Christian revivals which have taken place in the past have been characterized by their evanescence, but there is no evaporation of enthusiasm in Islam, because it has not only breadth and height, but it has also depth. It is broad: it does not demand from any of its adherents subscription to creed or articles which hinder the individual's research and study into various realms of knowledge because such pursuit might involve mental torture through doubting the truth of the creed to which he had subscribed. It is high, for it will lead the faithful plodder along the path of its commandments into the realm of communion with God. It is deep, for it is founded on eternal truth and cannot be shaken. No religion has yet stood, nor will stand, the test of time that is not founded, wholly or partially, upon eternal truth.

If it should become necessary to formulate a religion demanded by the mental, moral, and spiritual requirements of a world without a faith, what would be the result? Would it be a religion containing doctrines opposed to reason? Such, for example, as a Trinity of three persons in one? or of a god born as an infant of a human mother, growing up in the ordinary way to manhood, then, while still a young man, being crucified as a malefactor because others had transgressed the law which he, as god, had formulated and made his own death necessary to satisfy the requirements of that law? The absurd supposition that any man would invent such a religion as that may be dismissed without a moment's hesitation. Nor is it probable that a highly philosophical system such as Buddhism would be invented. But it is not beyond the possibility of

conception that the religion devised would approximate very closely to the Faith of Islam, even if it did not run entirely on its lines. Why? Because in Islam there is a lofty idealism conjoined with a rationalistic practicability. It does not ignore human nature, nor does it entangle itself in the tortuous pathways which lie outside the domain of the actual and real. It makes religion part of a man's life, and not a garment to be worn on special occasions and taken off when there is any real work to be done. For, to quote once more Mr. Gairdner's "Reproach of Islam": "It was no mere intellectual process, so far as can be made out, by which Muhammad passed to this belief in Allah, the one God. He did not merely come to possess it: it came to possess him. He was filled with a burning conviction that it was real, actual—that Allah was gripping him, and that neither he nor any created thing had any might at all as against Him. . . . He felt he had experienced Allah, a living, absolutely all-powerful and irresistible Being."

"THE GOSPEL OF LIFE"

ACCORDING TO JOHN RUSKIN

By Professor N. STEPHEN

"They who believe, AND DO GOOD WORKS, shall obtain forgiveness and an honourable provision."

AL QUR-ÁN, Sura 22.

"TO DO GOOD, whether you live or die, is the entrance to all principedoms."

JOHN RUSKIN.

FEW if any of our English writers are more often quoted than John Ruskin, and few have taken what *good men* think so true a view of life's duties, or a view so in accord with the highest teachings of religion and morality; on the other side, we are faced with the fact that in the opinion of clever men, smart men, and business men of the twentieth century, no man has ever held more Utopian or impracticable views on the same subject. Which is right? The answer to that must depend on your views, my reader, as to another question: Which is the greater and most worthy object in this life—a mere material and worldly success and advancement, or the gaining of such a character as will place you among those nobler souls whose aim is *to do good* regardless of mere self-aggrandisement?

The highest ideal of life has never been the popular one, for the "mutable many" love a mediocrity—one who will not point out their failings too plainly; one who will "hold a candle to the devil" rather than quarrel with him; and passes over their selfishness with a "Well, if you think it's right, perhaps it is so."

Under these circumstances, it seems to me it may be interesting and profitable to spend a short time in consideration of the views of this admittedly great man, who never played fast and loose with his own conscience, or failed or feared to say plainly what he thought was right and good, or to condemn what he thought wrong and evil; a man whose ideas of the duties and obligations of life were always pure and noble, and whose teaching was that no mere personal advantage could ever justify an injury to your fellow-man, or to mankind as a whole; a man of whom it has been said, "No man has ever run counter to the doctrines of so many authorities, and made so few enemies." Now just a brief sketch of the man before we go on to his teachings.

John Ruskin was born in London in February 1819, his father being a wealthy wine merchant, so that from the first he was in a position of independence, which later enabled him to write and speak fearlessly, not caring much whether he pleased or offended this person or that.

This same good fortune was not all to the good; for while he has written much in the purest and most exalted style, it led him at times into that extreme dogmatism which is the admitted great fault of much of his work, and as he grew older often led him to write and speak of such things as offended his artistic taste, or his views of the duties of life, in language not only of unsparing severity, but often in terms of such crudeness as to become almost offensive, and so to detract from rather than add to the force of his arguments. But such was his power, that the critics were mostly content to speak of these faults as a "love of singularity," or an "eccentricity of genius."

Educated at Oxford, Ruskin soon made his mark, taking the Newdigate Prize in 1839 and his degree in 1842. In 1843 he began his real literary career by the publication of the first volume of "Modern Painters," largely a defence of the methods and pictures of the artist Turner, but practically a strong plea for fidelity to nature. His own spirited and

sensitive personality makes itself felt all through the work ; its language is beautiful, and still captivates the thoughtful reader by its subtle charm, in spite of much of that mannerism to which I have referred ; and it also shows that even thus early in his career he was full of that love of nature and truth, and that yearning for things of an almost Arcadian and practically impossible nature, which marked much of his later work : things which I assert to be right in themselves, and only impracticable because of the low ideals and debased views of our so-called *high* civilization, and the hurry and rush caused by the competition and stress of the times in which we live—times in which mere utility has usurped the place of beauty, and cheapness the place of perfection ; times in which most people ask, not is this, or that, *the best possible*, but just “ *Will it do ?* If so, let it pass—hurry up, no time to bother about trifles ! ”

These views of Ruskin's culminated in 1870 in the formation of “The Society of St. George,” a kind of Utopian republic, where “man was to live content and honestly by the sweat of his brow, where no steam engine or machine of any kind should desecrate Nature”—a picture delightful to contemplate or think about, but one which his greatest admirers must admit to be impossible so long as man remains what he is. There can be no question that the work of to-day is inferior, or that machinery has come to stay, for good or evil ; the result being that all things are done at high pressure, in the shortest possible time, and at the lowest possible cost or the greatest possible profit. We must admit, however, that machinery means the death of artistry, and the production of articles by the gross is fatal to perfect work ; and in Ruskin's view, “Work that is anything short of the best work, is worse than no work at all.”

As a social reformer his earnestness and the purity and benevolence of his aims are fully recognized ; but their impossibility, or what was thought such, caused him to attain only a limited measure of success. One writer says of him : “The dreams of Owen or Fourier do not contradict the teachings of history, and of common sense, so manifestly as the doctrines of Ruskin on political and social economy.” And yet it is, to my mind, only the extreme measure of his views that made such a criticism possible ; for in a more limited

form, most that he argued for is now accepted as the true ground on which to build up a social community. From the first to the last volume of "Modern Painters" there is a period of seventeen years, during which Ruskin's views on the attitude of the age toward both religious and social conditions were both modified and strengthened. He became convinced that he had a message to deliver, and in 1860 that message was fully developed in "Unto this Last." It brought upon him a storm of opposition; but that had no effect in silencing him, and if anything it intensified, rather than modified, his views, which he fearlessly expressed up to the day of his death, January 20, 1900.

As an art critic he was supreme, and by his reverence for every created thing and the truth and nobility of his aims he did more to raise and refine the minds of his fellows than all the other critics of his time put together.

Whether in things social and political he was the dreamer his contemporaries would have us believe, or whether time will prove him to have been one of the great teachers of truth and goodness, born before the world was ripe to receive him, preaching a gospel so pure and unselfish that it was in advance of the age he lived in?—these are questions I am not prepared to answer, and which, in fact, cannot be answered with certainty till the experience of future years shall prove how far the things he held to be so are indeed (as I believe them to be) the very truth and essence of the highest moral and social good.

So far the man; permit me next to quote some of his teachings, with a few brief comments of my own apropos to life's duties.

The first thing I ask you to note is, that to Ruskin life was a time for *Work* and *Thought*, not for purposes of self-aggrandisement, but for the good of mankind at large. His creed may be expressed in the declaration that all personal rights were wrongs, if they were inimical to the welfare and progress of humanity as a whole. For instance—

"That the duty of a merchant was to provide for the wants of the people—not to make a fortune for himself."

Consequently he was diametrically opposed to the present-day idea that the value of an article should, or could, *honestly*, be regulated by "supply and demand," which he held to be

purely artificial, and possible of fraud of every kind. The only true and honest value of any production, he says, is—

“The cost of its production plus a small profit on the producer’s toil.”

Anything beyond this he held to be enriching the individual at the cost of society, and was therefore both unjust and wrong; and the man who, to use a modern phrase, “cornered the market” in order to artificially raised the price of an article—

“Deserved to be whipped at the cart tail.”

The true price of a thing should be its actual exchange value—not what it will fetch, which might be more or less, either of which would be unjust, the first to the purchaser, the second to the producer. Here are two views on the subject placed side by side for comparison:—

THE IDEAL.

“To buy in the cheapest in order to sell in the dearest market is little short of putting your hand in your neighbour’s pocket in order to fill your own.”

JOHN RUSKIN.

THE WORLDLY WISE.

“It is the very basis of commerce to give what you can produce *cheaply*, in exchange for what you most want. To buy in the cheapest and sell in the dearest market is not only the necessary rule of trade, but it is best for all.”

Sir J. LUBBOCK

(Lord Avebury).

Think them out; which is the nobler, better view? Is not Ruskin’s the nearest possible approach to *A Perfect Religion of Humanity*? But I fear the modern ideas are more truly expressed by the less worthy man, when he says, “The object of all trade is to make money and to enrich the trader.” To make money! To hear some people talk one would think money is everything; and yet it can buy neither health nor happiness, content nor a good reputation. Did the thought ever come to you, dear reader, that the over-greedy man will always be a poor man, because he never has enough? In other words, an inordinate love of riches

carries its own curse along with it. What said Seneca: "The poor man wanteth many things, the covetous man wanteth everything." Understand me clearly: I do not say money is in itself an evil, *at its proper valuation*. No, it is not *money*, but the undue *love of money*, THAT is the root of evil.

To enjoy riches, the heart must not be set too much on them. As Ruskin quaintly puts it:

"It is probably much happier to live in a small house and have Warwick Castle to be astonished at, than to live in Warwick Castle and have nothing to be astonished at."

Here, as everywhere, it would seem the "happy medium" is most to be desired: "Enough will carry you; more you yourself must carry" (Sadie). Holding such views as he did it is not surprising that Ruskin looked upon all merely speculative transactions as little short of dishonest. To him speculation was but gambling in disguise, and all gambling was but taking something from your fellows without giving any value in return; therefore the act of a rascal or thief. Said he, "You cannot get anything out of Nature, or from God, by gambling—only out of your neighbour."

I have already written, but I repeat it here, Life, according to Ruskin, was a time for work and *thought*. He was always opposed to hurry, or mere surface work, and the shallow, unthinking talk of Society. He wrote:

"The chief of all the curses of this unhappy age is the universal gabble of its fools, and of the flocks that follow them, rendering the quiet voices of the wise men of all past time inaudible"—

a severe, but well-deserved, rebuke of the sensation and notoriety-hunting of many of our (so-called) preachers and leaders of public opinion, and of the unthinking crowds who run after them, only to be misled by their impertinent assertions and unblushing ignorance.

Ruskin never came to a conclusion that he knew (that is, understood) a thing without long and careful thought. He said: "I find it takes *a great deal* of living to get *a little deal* of learning."*

This phrase is most characteristic of his style. Note the

* The italics in all cases are mine.—N. S.

singular but striking expression "a little deal of learning"—typical of his thoroughness and care.

And not time only, but work also, must be expended in order to attain to any good thing, any thing of real or lasting value.

"No one can teach you anything worth learning but through manual labour. The very bread of life can only be got out of the chaff of it, by rubbing it in your hands."

(Ruskin.)

Or in another form :

"What we think, what we know, or what we believe, is in the end of little consequence ; the only thing of consequence is *what we do*." (Ruskin.)

What is the lesson? Is it not this?—We have a limited choice as to what we do, but it is our duty to do something, and to do it to the very best of our ability.

"Good striving brings thriving" ;

and

"Better a dog that works
Than a lion that shirks."

One feels, in passing, that a shirking lion would have been no *lion* to Ruskin, who would at once have named him "but a silly ass."

Note this, however : his contempt and scorn of poor work was, if possible, excelled by his admiration of all honest, solid, useful work, whether in art or handicraft. "Work," said he, "is as necessary for peace of mind as health of body" ; and he was fully in accord with Emerson's fine passage :

"Whether thy work be coarse or fine, planting corn or writing epics, so only it be honest work, done to thine own approbation, it shall earn a reward, to the senses as well as to the thought. . . . The reward of a thing *well done* is, to have done it."

The great thing needful for all work is to "make haste slowly."

"Haste cometh of the evil one, but
Patience openeth the gate of Felicity."
Eastern Proverb.

Our duty, then, is to work well, and see to it that we do no work that we shall be ashamed of; and so we may earn peace and happiness, which with health is the most perfect ideal life. And yet how few are satisfied, and how many are crying out for this thing or that, without which they can never be happy or content—or so they think. Let such listen to Ruskin, who says :

“We complain of the want of many things—we want votes, we want liberty, we want amusements, we want money : which of us feels or knows that he wants peace ? There are two ways of getting it if you do want it. The first is wholly in your own power, to make yourselves nests of pleasant thoughts, . . . treasure-houses of precious and restful thoughts, which care cannot disturb, nor pain make gloomy, nor poverty take away from us. Houses, built without hands, for souls to live in.”

Quiet thoughts, soul communion with the mighty intellects of the past : it is the great misfortune of our age to have so little time for these things in which are to be found life's utmost enjoyment. Here are pleasures

“all men may enjoy, though few can achieve. . . . Most happy those whose pleasure is in memory, and their ambition in heaven.” (Ruskin.)

Whose ambition is in heaven : what a beautiful thought ! Not the ambition of this world's service or of the admiration of our fellows, not the ambition of wealth or power, but the ambition to do and to be good : good through faith in and obedience to God. Faith and obedience : has Ruskin any message on these ? Listen, and think for yourselves as he says :

“Faith, and obedience to some of our fellow-creatures, is the alphabet by which we learn the higher obedience to Heaven ; and it is not only needful to the prosperity of all united action, but essential to the happiness of all noble living spirits.”

Perhaps you may say, “Ah, but we are not satisfied with this faith, this half-knowledge, half-guesswork.” Let me assure you, after seventy-one years' experience of this life, that Ruskin never wrote more beautifully or more truthfully than this :

"Our happiness as human beings must hang on our being content to accept only partial knowledge, even in those matters which chiefly concern us, . . . perceiving a nobleness even in concealment ; rejoicing that the kindly veil is spread where the untempered light might have scorched us, or the infinite clearness wearied."

There is the spirit in which we should live, and in which we should hope to die : the spirit which will lead us to do all good things and avoid all evil things, which will help us to realize that the highest aim, the noblest part, in this life is

"to do good, whether you live or die, which is the entrance to all principedoms, and which if not done the day will come, and that infallibly, when you must labour for evil instead of good."

Think that last part out. If you have done no good, you must have done evil. There is no neutral ground : one way or the other your influence must count. Which shall it be ? It is for you to decide. Let me close by urging you to aim high ; strive after all that is just and pure and beautiful ; shun the evil and DO GOOD, so shall you attain to peace and felicity in this life, and joy and a good reward in life to come.

To all my readers may I say, "So may it be."

THE AGE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

ARTICLE II

By JOHN PARKINSON

WE now take the so-called Epistles of Ignatius : writings which have been the means of prolonging a controversy which ought to have been settled long ago. At the same time the controversy that raged over these Epistles has been described as a fine display of scholarship. That may be so if we limit the term scholarship to a knowledge of Greek and Latin. But if by scholarship we mean keen critical method, deep thinking, and wide knowledge, then to some of us the controversy was practically barren.

There are in all fifteen Epistles attributed to Ignatius, as follows :—

- | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|---------------|
| 1-2. To the Apostle John | — | two Epistles. |
| 3. To the Virgin Mary | — | one Epistle. |
| 4. To the Tarsians | " | " |
| 5. To the Antiochians | " | " |
| 6. To the Philippians | " | " |
| 7. To Hero a Deacon of Antioch | " | " |
| 8. To Mary of Cassobelœ | " | " |
| . | | |
| 9. To the Ephesians | " | " |
| 10. To the Magnesians | " | " |
| 11. To the Trallians | " | " |
| 12. To the Romans | " | " |
| 13. To the Philadelphians | " | " |
| 14. To the Smyrnæans | " | " |
| 15. To Polycarp | " | " |

Three Epistles exist only in Latin versions, the rest are extant both in Latin and Greek. The first eight in the list are generally regarded as spurious; the internal evidence shows that they are the product of a later period, nor are they mentioned in the works of any early writer. Of the last seven Epistles there are two versions of both Greek and Latin texts, a long version and a short version presenting considerable variations of reading. After a number of generations of discussion, critics in general came to the conclusion that the longer version was a later and interpolated form, the shorter version being the older and the original of the Epistles.

In 1845 the whole controversy was reopened by the publication by Dr. Cureton of a Syriac version of three Epistles—those to Polycarp, to the Ephesians, and to the Romans. They were found among a number of MSS. purchased by Dr. Tattam from the monks of St. Mary Deipara in the desert of Nitria. The Syriac versions are still shorter than the shorter Greek. Some maintain they are the originals, others that they are an epitome of the shorter Greek, while it is generally conceded that the shorter Greek versions are themselves interpolated. The controversy is not yet settled. My own opinion is that they are all spurious, and I do not see how any other result can be arrived at after an open-minded study of them. Of the supposed writer Ignatius we know practically nothing (save what the Epistles tell us, if we consider them genuine). He is men-

tioned and his letters referred to in the Epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians, an Epistle I shall deal with later. There are Martyrologies, but they are late and they are based on the Epistles. The whole story of his martyrdom is incredible principally as told in the Epistle to the Romans and in the Martyrology. He says :—

“From Syria even unto Rome I fight with beasts, both by land and sea, both by night and day, being bound to ten leopards, I mean a band of soldiers, who, even when they receive benefits, show themselves all the worse. But I am the more instructed by their injuries [to act as a disciple of Christ], ‘yet am I not thereby justified.’ May I enjoy the wild beasts that are prepared for me, and I pray they may be found eager to rush upon me, which also I will entice to devour me speedily, and not deal with me as with some, whom, out of fear, they have not touched. But if they be unwilling to assail me, I will compel them to do so. Pardon me [in this]: I know what is for my benefit. Now I begin to be a disciple. And let no one, of things visible or invisible, envy me that I should attain to Jesus Christ. Let fire and the cross; let the crowds of wild beasts; let tearings, breaking, and dislocations of bones; let cutting off of members; let shatterings of the whole body; and let all the dreadful torments of the devil come upon me: only let me attain to Jesus Christ” (Epistle to the Romans, ch. v.).¹

I leave readers to form their own opinion of the mental plane of the writer of the above. The writer is supposed to have been condemned to death by Trajan when he wintered at Antioch during the Parthian wars (115 A.D.)²—to be taken to Rome and given to the wild beasts. The Epistles are assumed to have been written on the journey from Antioch to Rome when the writer was under the guard of Roman soldiers. As we have seen, he complains of their cruelty and compares them to wild beasts. Yet he has perfect freedom of action to see his friends, to write Epistles, to receive bishops and deacons and deputations from the Christian communities of the towns through which he passed, and he is accompanied by devoted followers, without any apparent opposition from the “ten leopards.” He is per-

¹ Trans. by Rev. Dr. Roberts and Sir J. Donaldson, Ante-Nicene Chris. Lib.

² Or, as some say, 107 A.D.

mitted by those "cruel," "wild beasts" of soldiers to do the very things for which the Emperor is supposed to have condemned him. The whole story is absurd. The Roman legionaries who stood at their posts while Vesuvius belched from the entrails of the earth smoke and flame and ashes and red-hot lava; who stood immovable while the flowing, boiling matter crept from foot to knee, from knee to waist, and then to the unconquerable heart, were not made of the stuff here depicted and were not the men to flout the mandate of their Emperor. The whole history of the Roman soldier proclaims with voiceless scorn the spuriousness of the tale and the falseness of the Epistles. Irenæus, who lived during the period between 140 (145)–202 A.D., quotes a passage from the Epistle to the Romans without naming the source—in fact, Lardner doubts if it is a quotation at all. Origen, in the *first half of the third century*, twice refers to Ignatius by name, quoting a passage from the Epistle to the Romans: "But my love is crucified," and one from the Epistle to the Ephesians: "From the Prince of this world was concealed the virginity of Mary." Eusebius mentions the seven Epistles generally accepted as genuine (principally on account of his reference); he quotes from the Epistle to the Romans, cites Irenæus, and quotes the sentence previously quoted by Origen and a few words from an apocryphal Gospel contained in the Epistle to the Smyrnæans. It is to be noted that with the exception of the latter all the quotations occur in the Syriac version, and we have no Syriac version of that Epistle. Athanasius is the first writer to attribute to Ignatius any passage of the three Epistles of which we have Syriac versions not contained in the Syriac text, and that in the *second half of the fourth century*.¹ Various writers have claimed (in the shorter Greek) a few passages as being taken from our Gospels; none are worth serious consideration. As an example, I take the principal—that in the Epistle to the Romans, ch. vi. :—

"All the pleasures of the world, and all the kingdoms of this age (or earth or time), shall profit me nothing. It is better for me to die in behalf of (or into) Jesus Christ, than to reign over all the ends of the earth. 'For what shall a man be profited if he gain the whole world, but lose his own soul.' Him I seek who died for us; Him I desire

¹ I make this statement on the authority of Cassels, as I have read every writer myself.

who rose again for our sake. This is the gain which is laid up for me."

The last sentence is the only one of all the above in the Syriac version, where it appears in a different form. It is evident that the quotation from Matt. xvi. 26 is an interpolation. It is omitted from the Latin version, and, according to Cassels, is absent from the passage in the work of Timotheus of Alexandria. If readers will omit it they will have the whole passage complete without it, the sense clearer, and the composition more perfect. It is evidently a gloss; some early reader, finding a similarity between the opening sentence and Matthew, wrote the latter passage on the margin, and it became incorporated in the text. Most critics acknowledge it is a later addition. Interpolation by later hands was common in the early period. No writings show the system better than the Epistles we are examining, and at the risk of tiring readers I give a lengthy example on the plea that it should be of interest to them, and that it is only by a knowledge of such methods they can arrive at a correct judgment.

EPISTLE TO THE SMYRNÆANS.

Short Greek Version.

CHAPTER III.

"For I know that after His resurrection also He was still possessed of flesh, and I believe that He is so now. When, for instance, He came to those who were with Peter, He said to them, '*Lay hold, handle me, and see that I am not an incorporeal spirit.*' And immediately they touched Him, and believed, being convinced both by His flesh and spirit. For this cause also they despised death and were found its conquerors. And after His resurrection He did eat and drink with them, as being possessed of flesh, although spiritually He was united to the Father."

It will be seen that the chapter does not contain a single quotation from, nor a single reference to, our Gospels. It attributes certain words to Jesus not contained in our Gospels. I have put them in italics. Eusebius quotes the passage, and says he does not know from whence it is taken. Jerome says the quotation is to be found in the "Gospel according to the

Hebrews," a Gospel in use among the Nazarenes, of which more later. Origen quotes the passage from a work used by the Early Church, "The Teaching of Peter." As we shall see, those early writers make use of apocryphal Gospels containing sayings some differing from those in our Gospels, others similar, or almost so. It is well to remember this point, as it is important.

Long Greek Version.

CHAPTER III.

"And I know that He was possessed of a body not only in His being born and crucified, but I also know that He was so after His resurrection, and believe that He is so now. When, for instance, He came to those who were with Peter, He said to them, 'Lay hold, handle me, and see that I am not an incorporeal spirit.' 'For a spirit has not flesh and bones, as ye see me have.' And He says to Thomas, 'Reach hither thy finger into the print of the nails, and reach hither thy hand and thrust it into my side'; and immediately they believed that He was Christ. Wherefore Thomas also says to Him, 'My Lord, and my God.' And on this account also did they despise death, for it were too little to say, indignities and stripes. Nor was this all; but also after He had shown Himself to them, that He had risen indeed, and not in appearance only, He both ate and drank with them during forty entire days. And thus was He, with the flesh, received up in their sight unto Him that sent Him, being with that same flesh to come again, accompanied by glory and power. For say the [holy] oracles, 'This same Jesus, who is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come, in like manner as ye have seen Him go unto heaven.' But if they say that He will come at the end of the world without a body, how shall those 'see Him that pierced Him,' and when they recognize Him, 'mourn for themselves'? For incorporeal beings have neither form nor figure, nor the aspect (or mark) of an animal possessed of shape, because their nature is in itself simple."

Readers will easily see the additions for themselves, containing passages having parallels in Luke xxiv. 39; John xx. 27, 28; Acts i. 11; Rev. i. 7; Zech. xii. 10; the argument

throughout maintaining a bodily resurrection. Neither the Syriac versions nor the short Greek contain any evidence of the existence of our Gospels or even of the writers thereof; while the long Greek versions giving passages which occur in our Gospels neither mention the source nor name any of our Gospels, and they might well have been taken from apocryphal works. They are certainly late, and whether spurious or the original Epistles of one Ignatius, they give no support to our Gospels as credible witnesses to the events they describe, or of their trustworthiness or of their authorship.

(To be continued.)

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF THE PERSIAN AND ARABIAN MYSTIC POETS

By PROF. A. NEVILLE J. WHYMAN, Ph.D., Litt.D., F.S.P.

IT is an amazing thought to many people that the religion generally accepted by the West as its own came from the East. Also it is difficult for these same people to realize that the most characteristically Oriental books comprised in the Bible are those which are most mystic and most puzzling to them. Perhaps this may be made a little more possible and comprehensive when the following notes have been read.

It is my object, in bringing in a new series of articles to these pages, to show the essential difference between Oriental and Occidental forms of expression. There is a subtle quality in the very words of the Oriental tongues which is generally too elusive to be caught by any but practised scholars. Nevertheless, I shall try to give some idea of the *living* link existing between word and idea in these tongues of mystic lands.

To take a common and everyday example. All know how very wide is the use of the word "love" in English. A child filled with excessive liking for some article of food says he "loves" it, and even in later life this word serves as an exaggerated form of the verb "to like." Thus the very idea of reciprocity (so essential in the use of the Arabic and Persian words of this meaning) becomes insignificant to the point of extinction or worse. Beautiful as some of the love-poems in the English language are, it is impossible to be satisfied with them after reading the living, breathing passion-songs of Hafiz,

Al-Ghazzali, and Abu L'ala. The Latin *amor* means an abstract emotion merely, while the Greek ERŌS, or EROS, was thought to be so far beyond the power of mortal conception as to be deified, and thus *eros*, from meaning "love," came to mean the God of love. Even the passionate Romance-peoples find something missing, for they have inherited the dignified Roman *abstract* word and its corresponding sense. Thus we read in some very fine Spanish stanzas :

"Would that the soul of me
 Could speak to thee.
Amor does not explain—
 I must complain ;
 But eyes with passion filled
 Seek *thee* again."

The Italian *amore* is very sweet in sound, but alas ! there is no more life or fire in the word than is found in the *amor* of its parent-tongue. The French *l'amour* pleads with pathetic voice for a stronger meaning, while the German *die Liebe* has no more intrinsic merit than its host of neighbours so far as a word's passion goes. In all these tongues we find a *root* instead of a living syllable, and this is the great difficulty in *writing* one's feelings. The Russian LUBOV does to a certain extent hold an emotion in addition to a root idea, but so do all languages of Ural-Altaic extraction.

Yet again we turn to the East. For thousands of years the East has cherished as its greatest treasure the gift of mystic and immortal song. Not only have our greatest philosophers been trained in the schools of the Orient, not only have we taken thence all religious light we may possess, but the cynic and world-weary turn there for the refreshing breeze of mysticism and the quickening odes and stanzas of love.

In the earliest literature we find the emotions represented. Ancient China first sang odes telling of love and passion. The dainty character which stands for this word in that language is read AI, and but for the difficulty of reproduction would be given here. But be it said that to a Chinese such a character conveys far more than "love" or any of its counterparts in the West. The 'ASHQ of Arabia, ISHQ of Persia, MAḤABBAT of the Urdu Indians, the root-idea of SUKU and HORERU of the Japanese, all give an inexpressible *feeling* alongside their general duty of conveying a definite *meaning*. But much is lost in not being able to give the characters in their native

dress. Be it said, however, that in Oriental languages the main idea is to speak to the *inner* consciousness, *not* merely to give an idea or a clue to a general idea.

I have taken the one example given above for various reasons, but chiefly because it is a word interwoven inextricably with the life of all people. Also I shall give in later articles some translations from the languages mentioned above for the purposes of comparison. It is often urged that the Old Testament should be read in Hebrew and the New Testament in Greek, as by being satisfied with a translation one loses the *real sense* of many passages. I quite agree, and if there are those who claim to point out its impossibility, I would show them the millions of Indians, Persians and Turks whose holy Book is the Qur-án and who read it *in Arabic*. In fact, the language in which any book really worth its name is written is only fit for that language, as its intrinsic merit is lost in the transition into another tongue.

It was an old Spanish author who, recognizing the genius of language, said : "Translations are but tapestries seen on the wrong side." Even to-day a great *littérateur* in fields of Oriental scholarship realizes this ; for, going beyond the old Spanish bibliophile, he says : "All translators are *ipso facto* traitors." And for this reason I come to you in the endeavour to show the subtle link that binds together word and idea in the languages of the East, that you may possess the key to the proper understanding of the mystic lore of bygone years and depend no more upon the inefficient crutch which, by its very existence, exiles the soul of the message from the literal and exact phraseology which claims to reproduce the original.

THERE is no poverty harder than ignorance, no wealth more valuable than knowledge, no madness worse than conceit.

Admirable beauty consists in elegant speech, and perfect greatness in handsome deed.

Wine is the compendium of all sin.

Faithful (*m'umin*) is he who does not injure a soul.

The purest faith consists in the greatest love of mankind.

Forgiveness increases but respect for man, and humility increases but dignity.

Charity never decreases wealth.

SAYINGS OF MUHAMMAD.

ISLAM AND CIVILIZATION

THE VIEWS OF COLONEL INGERSOLL, THE GREAT AMERICAN FREETHINKER

OFTEN we are told that the terms "Christianity" and "Civilization" are synonymous, and that the world is indebted to the Christians for all the enlightenment and freedom which we possess to-day. It is as well to consider these statements with an open mind, to take impartial testimony, neither Muslim nor Christian, and thus the following words of Colonel R. G. Ingersoll, the great Freethinker, are very instructive. No one can charge him with favouring either Islam or Christianity, but he reviews the situation with a calm, analytical, sceptical mind, believing, as he does, in no religious system :—

"In the tenth century after Christ the Saracens, governors of a vast empire, established colleges in Mongolia, Tartary, Persia, Mesopotamia, Syria, Egypt, North Africa, Morocco, Fez, and in Spain. The religion owned by the Saracens was greater than the Roman Empire. They had not only colleges, but observatories. The sciences were taught. They introduced the ten numerals, taught algebra and trigonometry, understood cubic equations, knew the art of surveying; they made catalogues and maps of the stars, gave the great stars the names they still bear; they ascertained the size of the earth, determined the obliquity of the ecliptic, and fixed the length of the year. They calculated the eclipses, equinoxes, solstices, conjunctions of planets, and occultations of stars. They constructed astronomical instruments. They made clocks of various kinds, and were the inventors of the pendulum. They originated chemistry, discovered sulphuric acid, nitric acid, and alcohol.

"They were the first to publish pharmacopœias and dispensaries.

"In mechanics they determined the law of falling bodies. They understood the mechanical powers, and the attraction of gravitation.

"They taught hydrostatics, and determined the specific gravities of bodies.

"In optics they discovered that a ray of light did not proceed from the eye to an object, but from the object to the eye.

"They were manufacturers of cotton, leather, paper, and

steel. They gave us the game of chess. They produced romances and novels, and essays on many subjects.

"In their schools they taught the modern doctrines of evolution and development. They anticipated Darwin and Spencer.

"These people were not Christians. They were the followers, for the most part, of an impostor, of a pretended prophet, of a false god. And yet, while the true Christians—the men selected by the true God, and filled with the Holy Ghost—were tearing out the tongues of heretics, these wretches were irreverently tracing the orbits of the stars. While the true believers were flaying philosophers and extinguishing the eyes of thinkers, these godless followers of Muhammad were founding colleges, collecting manuscripts, investigating the facts of Nature, and giving their attention to science. But it is well to know that we are indebted to the Moors, to the followers of Muhammad, for having laid the foundations of modern science. It is well to know that we are not indebted to the Church, to Christianity, for any useful fact. . . . It is as well to know that when Muhammadans were the friends of science, Christians were its enemies."

Thus Colonel Ingersoll gives the lie to those who write that Islam is stagnant and incompatible with progress. Such people have a very convenient memory which forgets the "dark ages," when Europe was sunk in the deepest gloom, when knowledge was at its lowest ebb, when Christians and Jews who wished to learn had to go to Muslim colleges, in Muslim lands. Here they could learn in peace without persecution, but in their own homes they might be arrested and burnt as wizards or witches. Europe was crushed by Christianity, and has evolved and civilized itself in spite of the Church, which has been the enemy of progress in all lands and in all ages.

THE TEMPTATION

"VICTORY over Temptation" is a favourite subject with man; we read of it in every nation. It vindicates real character. It brings forth the real worth which one beset with temptation possesses. Great men in history have been brought through trials and temptations; they have been handicapped with hardships and adversity; and they have shown that they could withstand and master the situation. They have thus left

indelible impressions in human history, which serve as a guide to others. Their noble examples invigorate their weaker brethren and infuse their followers with the spirit of perseverance to meet the trials of life. We read of a temptation in the Bible. Jesus was "led up of the spirit into the wilderness to be tempted of the devil." . . . "Again, the devil taketh him up into an exceeding high mountain, and sheweth him all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them ; and saith unto him, 'All these things will I give thee if thou wilt fall down and worship me.'" Jesus would not listen to the offer, and the devil left him and "angels came and ministered unto him." A beautiful story and an interesting object-lesson for a Sunday-school, but no light for the dark recesses of ordinary life. It lacks in colours of reality, and is not readable in the language of human experience. It was, after all, a vision as it is now believed. One subject to a vision is in a passive state of mind, and his experience in that condition neither adds to nor subtracts anything from his worth.

But we read in history of a real temptation in the life of one who passed successfully through different phases of life, whose variegated existence is a mirror from which all noble qualities in man reflect in their deep dye : we mean Muhammad, the last of the Prophets, who exhibited humanity to its best advantage.

In the early days of his ministry he was beset with hardships and trials. He, and with him the band of the faithful, were subjected to every imaginable sort of persecution : Hunger and privation, libel and slander, physical and mental torture, danger to life and property—he was exposed to all, yet nothing could smother the Divine flame kindled in his breast to render true service to humanity. Every hardship proved to be but a new impetus to fresh efforts, and every hardship a renovator of his energies. This marvellous perseverance and this stupendous firmness of resolution roused amazement and excited wonder even in the ranks of his enemies. Being tired of their campaign of persecution they thought of compromise, and conferred together to find some means of conciliation. The past unblemished character of Muhammad and his honesty of purpose could not be lost sight of, nor could they ignore his high connections and his own noble personality. But their moral perception could not reach his ideal of one's duty to God and mankind. Wealth, woman and power are the three chief incentives of

human activities in almost every shade of life, and Muhammad in the judgment of his enemies could not be indifferent to common human weakness. The heads of the various tribes in Mecca met Muhammad, under the leadership of Utba, when the Prophet was sitting in the great Temple. On being asked his purpose, Utba addressed the man after the heart of God in a long speech, which may be summarized thus: "We come to thee to restore peace, love and amity between you and ourselves. We know thy antecedents, thou art noble thyself and comest of noble ancestors. Thou hast always loved truth and peace and hast rightly won from us the title of El-Ameen (the faithful, the honest, the peace-maker). Through thy intervention we have many a time been saved from civil war; but for the last few years thou art changed: thou hast begun to speak ill of our idols and hast caused great consternation of mind; our various tribes are at variance with one another, and each family has become a prey to dissension and discord. We come to thee with conciliatory terms. If thou dost care for any particular woman we will bring her to thee; if thou art in need of wealth, all the treasures we possess will be at thy feet; and if thou art after power, we accept thee as our leader; we are ready to do all this, thou art worthy of it, but we cannot bear the disgrace our gods have been put to through thy religion. Thou art welcome to all we have, but spare our idols."

Those were tempting offers, and the temptation was so real, so bewitching. Nothing was visionary in this. All was in real earnestness. An immediate relief was offered to all the troubles and privations, and a ready accomplishment of what has been ascribed to Muhammad by his Western detractors as the object of his mission. He could avail himself of this golden opportunity if power and wealth were the goal of his life. He could achieve at once what came to him afterwards after the hardest trials of life if that was his main object. But the great Divine soul knew no compromise in his zeal to establish the "Kingdom of Heaven" on earth. He knew the position and influence of the deputation before him; he was quite alive to the situation, and was perfectly cognizant that to reject the offer meant invoking the outbreak of merciless war against him—and so it proved afterwards; but nothing could daunt him or subdue his indomitable will. He rose calmly from his seat and gave utterance to the following verses from the Qu-rán with his usual serenity:—

"Whoso believe not and prevent others from the way of God, their works will He cause to miscarry. But whoso believe and do the things that are right, and believe in what hath been sent down to Muhammad—for it is the truth from their Lord—their sins will He cancel and dispose their hearts aright."

"This because the infidels followed vanity, while those who believe followed the truth from their Lord. Thus to men doth God set forth their likeness" (Qur-án 47: 1-3).

After citing the above, Muhammad said: "Two classes of men have been described in these words, choose one of them thou hast desire to identify with, and this is my reply."

Here was the true temptation to one in need, in adversity, in hardship; and here was the man who overcame it.

THE SOLIDARITY OF ISLAM

By PROF. H. M. LÉON, M.A., LL.D., F.S.P.

IN considering as to whether a Religion is one which can lay claim to Divine origin it is necessary to regard it from several points of view. It must certainly possess the attributes of being practicable, reasonable and enduring. One point that impresses all persons with regard to Islam is its solidarity. The opponents of Islam have sought to minimize this fact and to explain it away by a variety of circumstances. In no other Faith is this solidarity so apparent. Even its opponents are compelled to admit that the Prophet himself was a great politician and laid down certain injunctions which have helped materially to bind the followers of the Faith together for all time. One of these elements is the absolute fraternity which exists between Muslims. The Qur-án declares in emphatic language, "Verily the true believers are brethren," and experience shows that this is not merely an expression but a reality. It is not merely preached but practised. It is not merely a lip-statement of "Dearly beloved brethren" from the pulpit, but a fraternal feeling existing between all Muslims, high or low, rich or poor, whatever may be the country, race, or language. Islam does not regard the colour of a man's skin any more than that of his hair or eyes as a test upon which to decide as to whether he

shall be admitted into the brotherhood or not. The African, the Indian, the Chinese and the European, immediately they repeat the Kalima, enter into the fraternity of the Faith and become equally brethren.

Islam in its mosques and places of worship carries out this principle in its entirety. There are in the mosques no reserved seats and no pews. All who enter therein are equal. Outside the door of a mosque a man may be a sovereign or a prince; inside he is on the same level in the sight of Allah and of his fellow-believers as the poorest worshipper—aye, even as the man who craves alms at the door of the sanctuary. They all pray to God standing shoulder to shoulder; in fact, the injunctions of the Faith are so strict that in forming the ranks for prayers it is enjoined that the top of one true believer's shoulder shall touch that of his next neighbour on the other side.

In a Muslim country each quarter of the town has its own place of worship which is open day and night for worship, but it is enjoined that all Muslims in that district shall assemble therein upon the Jumma, or Day of Assembly, in order that they may unite in worship of the Most High. But at certain times of the year, particularly on the two greater festivals of the Id-ul-Fitr and Id-ul-Zuhr, the true believers are all enjoined to assemble in the largest mosque or in some field or other convenient place, and there all unite in worship, thus bringing together the little isolated groups into one huge congregation.

Nor is this all. For there is a further injunction that once in every true believer's life, provided he or she can do so without injury to himself or herself, or to his or her family, such true believer has to make the Hadj or pilgrimage to Mecca, where, in common with other true believers assembled from every part of the habitable globe, they are to worship God around the Kaaba or Holy Temple at Mecca. This ordinance of the pilgrimage not only brings together the various races and peoples who have followed Islamic teaching, enabling them to understand one another better, but it also acts as a very powerful agent in consolidating the faith and keeping it uniform in its practices and precepts. Here they see the ceremonies of Islam performed in exactly the same manner as they were performed by the Prophet himself, and, consequently, any innovations which may have crept in are promptly corrected and amended. Thus it is that those differences of practice and of

creed which have become so prevalent in other faiths are promptly eradicated in Islam should they at any time have arisen.

It must not be thought, however, that Islam is a hidebound faith in which no liberty of thought is permitted. On the contrary, the utmost liberty of thought and judgment is allowed within its fold, consistent with the cardinal principles of the Faith. The Prophet himself said: "In Islam, in essentials there must be unity, in non-essentials liberty, but in all things let there be charity and fraternity." Although there are different schools of thought in Islam, yet at the annual pilgrimage at Mecca all meet as one solid whole and unite in their devotions to the Eternal God, there being no difference in their articles of faith or principles of practice.

THE PROPHET'S TRUST IN GOD

By MOHD SAMEER BIN HAJIE ISMAIL EFFENDI of Ceylon

IT is the noble words of those in adversity that carry a world of matter worthy of our serious study. Indeed, the principles enunciated by them are the real guidance for both individuals and communities. The world has always taxed its great men with error, but only a small minority have ever come out of the furnace of calamity unburnt. Their words portray their very *inner self*. They paid high ransom in forbearance to adequately illumine the hearts of the ignorant.

The sufferings of those who laboured to establish a new set of ideas were indeed great, but the Poor Mortal who had to endure the most cruel persecution, not to avenge an angry God, nor to bribe the Almighty with a few drops of blood, but to restore faith in the existence of the One God, is our Holy Prophet Muhammad, may peace be upon him !

With the proclamation of his mission, the Prophet was made the target of the enemy's persecution. He was taunted, jeered, and the most vile accusations were made against him. There was no law to govern the country, and the Muslims, who were bereft of influence, were compelled to share the fate of their Persecuted Master. The immoral men of Arabia unsheathed their swords to defend idolatry, against which Islam was combating. The new faith was a formidable foe, resting on the

impregnable fortress of Divine help. The Prophet was hunted from place to place. The Muslims had to undergo unspeakable tortures because of their faith, which was very dear to them. Once the ruffians tried to strangle the Prophet. Stones were hurled at him to cause his destruction. The enemy dissuaded the people from listening to Muhammad, whom they represented as an impostor, though they had honoured him as Al Ameen—the Trustworthy—before his prophethood. When they failed to stop his preaching, they drowned his sonorous voice by hideous and unseemly shouting.

Samiya and Yasir were brutally murdered, and Hobbaib had his body cut piecemeal, having been previously offered his freedom if he would renounce Islam. Abu Bakr was expelled from Mecca as an outlaw. Billal was daily made to lie on the hill of Battia with his face turned towards the sun and a huge stone placed upon his chest. Another Muslim had each of his legs tied to camels, which were driven in opposite directions, thus tearing the body in two. The Prophet was forced to be an eye-witness to the suffering of his beloved ones, who preferred to stand by their master in weal and woe rather than renounce their faith.

Merciless and cruel as they were, they sought every means to end Muhammad (on whom be peace) and his movement. Unfortunately the Prophet could not count upon the sympathy of all his relatives. Of his uncles, Abu Gahl was the bitterest enemy, and Abu Taleb—the most honoured—was the Prophet's friend.

The Quraish were aware of Muhammad's regard for his guardian uncle, Abu Taleb; and as their oppression of the Muslim did not effectively change Islam's adherents, they approached him with a request to stop his nephew's preaching or to side with him so that the matter would be settled by an armed contest. Abu Taleb feared greatly for the life of one whom he dearly cherished, and he appealed to the Quraish to safeguard the Prophet, who was one of their own people.

Failing to convince the Quraish of the Prophet's peaceful attitude and the excellence of his doctrine, Abu Taleb advised his nephew to comply with the enemy's request, as the Quraish, who were exasperated, were determined to do him further harm. He was not aware of the Prophet's reliance on God,

whose messenger he was. It was while under the care of Abu Taleb that our Prophet learnt of the appalling decadence of faith in God. Muhammad (our Prophet) was not moved at the changed attitude of his uncle, and little fearing the new turn of events replied thus:—

“O my uncle, if they brought the sun to stand on my right hand and the moon on my left hand, to force me from my undertaking, verily they would not, until the Lord made manifest my cause or I perished in the attempt.”

I would request the reader to reflect on the above words. They are not the wild vapourings of a disordered brain, but the result of assurance given by the Almighty. How sincere is his claim to duty though on the brink of destruction! A solitary man, he departs from the durbar of Abu Taleb, for earth could not inflict any injury as long as the rope of faith which bound him to heaven was safe. Little did he hesitate at the withdrawal of his uncle's help. This scene of Muhammad's life is itself a convincing proof that he was none but the Elect of God, sent by the Merciful to regenerate humanity. This is but one of the traits of innate nobility of character noticeable in the Prophet. The above words are worthy to be inscribed in letters of gold on the pages of history. Of all the incidents through which the Prophet passed, this period of adversity was to prove the turning point of his mission. Separated from his guardian uncle, whom the Quraish also respected as their Patriarch, had Muhammad lost faith in God the enemy would have wiped Islam from the surface of the globe. He stands majestically at his post when the whole Arabian desert was burning with the fire of hatred, quite indifferent to its threatening, and tells the Quraish through Abu Taleb that he would perish rather than disregard his mission. Peace be upon the man who re-established the faith taught by Noah, Abraham, Moses, and Jesus!

SAY (O Muhammad): My prayers and my worship and my life and my death are for the sake of God, Lord of the Worlds. He hath no peer. This am I commanded, and I am foremost in obedience (to God).